REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Entry of this amendment is believed appropriate for several reasons. The amendments to claims 1 and 11 have been made to address the §112, first paragraph rejection made in the final office action. No new issues requiring further search or substantive consideration not already considered by the Examiner have been raised by these amendments. Moreover, the amendments certainly place the claims in better form for consideration on appeal since they overcome the rejection under §112, first paragraph. See 36 CFR §1.116(b)(1)(2).

Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-21 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to remove the word programmable as an adjective with respect to the exception trap mask register, (even though one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that a register in which the value held within that register is programmed is a "programmable register"). The Examiner's concern should therefore be overcome.

With respect to claim 21, while the exact terminology "embodied in a tangible medium and executable on a data processing apparatus" is not literally used in the original application, one of ordinary skill in the art having read the entire application would certainly understand that claim 21 finds adequate written description and enabling support in the original specification and drawings as filed. For example, an overview of the computer system is shown in Figure 1 and includes not only a processor core with an ALU 16 and registers 14, but several blocks represent several memory blocks including blocks 36, 38, and 56. Various figures illustrate different portions of memory, (see, for example, Figures 41-46, and block 474 shown as memory). Several of the figures also illustrate procedures carried out by the processor in flowchart form.

One of ordinary skill would certainly understand that a computer program must be embodied in a tangible medium such as a memory and that such computer programs are embodied in tangible mediums like memory for the sole purpose of being executed by a data processing apparatus, such as the processing core shown in Figure 1. The Examiner's attention is also directed to page 38, lines 1-4 which state while the invention was described with "reference to apparatus having a processor, the invention may be implemented by a computer program which when run on a suitable processor configures the processor to operate as described." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 is adequately described and enabled when understood by a person of ordinary skill in this art in light of the specification as filed.

Claims 11 and 13-21 stand rejected under 35 USC, paragraph 101 as alleged directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is traversed.

With respect to claim 21, all computer programs stored in memory or any other tangible medium are necessarily executable by a data processing apparatus. The program instructions are not executed simply by virtue of being stored in memory. It is not understood how else the Examiner could be interpreting a computer program product claim. The claim is believed to be statutory.

The Examiner continues to maintain that the method claims do not result in a tangible result" and are "directed to an abstract idea" and that the process does not "set forth a practical application...to produce a real-world result." Applicants respectfully disagree. Method claim 11 specifically recites a "method of controlling exception processing of a processor." Microprocessors are used by millions (if not billions) of people everyday, either directly or indirectly. It is very difficult to understand how a method of controlling such a real-world device is not a practical application that produces a real-world result. In addition, independent claim 11

recites structure for implementing the method, i.e., the processor that performs the recited steps. There are likely thousands if not more issued U.S. patents directed to methods for controlling a data processor. Applicants are not aware of any statutory authority or recent case law which indicates that methods for controlling data processors are non-statutory. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-11, and 14-21 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Christie et al. This rejection is again respectfully traversed.

In addition to the distinctions set forth in the prior response, claims 1 and 11 recite that the exception trap mask register stores plural programmable parameters which allows flexibility in the way different exceptions should be handled. That flexibility is absent in Christie. The single parameter identified by the Examiner in Christie as the SEM flag controls all of the exceptions so that they are treated in the same way. Either all exceptions are referred through the same kernel, or they are all handled in the normal, non-secure fashion. Hence, Christie fails to disclose "each of said plural programmable parameters respectively specifying whether a corresponding exception should be handled by a secure mode exception handler executing in a secure mode or should be handled an exception handler executing in a mode within a current one of said secure domain and said non-secure domain when that exception occurs." Withdrawal of the anticipation rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding the double-patenting rejection with respect to commonly assigned U.S. Patent 7,117,284, Applicants have submitted a terminal disclaimer without agreeing with the rejection. Withdrawal of this double-patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to the two co-pending applications noted by the Examiner in paragraph 17, Applicants do not believe that a terminal disclaimer is appropriate in Serial No. 10/714,563 (a

Notice of Allowance was mailed on July 27, 2007), which Applicants believe is patentably distinct. Co-pending application 10/714,519 is still pending and has not yet been allowed. There, the issue of double-obviousness double-patenting is premature.

The application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____
John R. Lastova
Reg. No. 33,149

JRL:maa
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100